

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	' FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/799,047 03/11/2004		Richard David Taylor	10031197-1	6727	
57299 Kathy Manke	7590 01/17/20	008	EXAMINER		
Avago Technol		PATEL, HETUL B			
4380 Ziegler Road Fort Collins, CO 80525			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
1011 00111115, 0	0 00020		2186		
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			01/17/2008	ELECTRONIC	

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

avagoip@system.foundationip.com kathy.manke@avagotech.com scott.weitzel@avagotech.com

_
-
''
•

## **Advisory Action**

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/799,047	TAYLOR, RICHARD DAVID		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Hetul Patel	2186		

Defense the Fillian of an Assess Daied					
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Hetul Patel	2186			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress		
THE REPLY FILED 21 December 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS	S APPLICATION IN CONDITION F	OR ALLOWANCE.			
<ol> <li>The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or or this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notal Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliant time periods:</li> <li>The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing</li> </ol>	wing replies: (1) an amendment, aff otice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in ce with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply m	fidavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3)		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A	•	in the final rejection, wh	ichever is later In		
no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailin (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THI 06.07(f).	g date of the final rejecti E FIRST REPLY WAS F	on. ILED WITHIN		
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office late may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply orig r than three months after the mailing da ).	of the fee. The approprince in the final Office of the final rejection, of the final rejection, of the final rejection, of the final rejection, of the final rejection.	iate extension fee ce action; or (2) as even if timely filed,		
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed AMENDMENTS	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th	ns of the date of e appeal. Since		
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,			ecause		
<ul> <li>(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further co</li> <li>(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below)</li> </ul>		TE below);			
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in be appeal; and/or		ducing or simplifying	the issues for		
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.1	, -	ected claims.			
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1	` ''	mnliant Amondment	(DTOL 224)		
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)		impliant Amendment	(FTOL-324).		
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a non-allowable claim(s).		timely filed amendme	ent canceling the		
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  Claim(s) allowed:		II be entered and an e	explanation of		
Claim(s) objected to: <u>4-13</u> . Claim(s) rejected: <u>1 and 3</u> .					
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:  AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE					
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bubecause applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).					
The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).					
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatio REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attach	ned.		
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but	at does NOT place the application in	n condition for allowar	nce because:		
<ul> <li>12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).</li> <li>13. ☒ Other: See Continuation Sheet.</li> </ul>	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).				

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The proposed after-final amendments (specifically to claims 6-8) raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search..

Continuation of 13. Other: As to remark, Applicant asserted that

- (a) the Tanaka reference fails to disclose, teach or suggest a shared system register that includes bits defining an access protocol and one or more data bits, as required by claim 1.
- (b) Tanaka does not teach the access type being selected from the group that includes READ, READ/CLEAR, READ/SET, and READ/WRITE, as required by claim 3. Applicants agree that once register access is given to any of the four processors that the select processor can read/write into that register. However, Applicant's claim 3 clearly includes more selections than read and write. A bit in a two-dimensional array that indicates access connectivity between a processor and a shared register cannot disclose, teach.or suggest a group of access types that includes four members. At most a single bit can denote an on/off or connected/disconnected state. For at least this separate and distinct reason, Applicant's dependent claim 3 is not anticipated by Tanaka.

Examiner respectfully traverses Applicant's arguments for following reasons:

In response to (a), Examiner would like to point out to Applicant that the claimed shared system registers are compared with the combination of R1 and 21, R2 and 22, R3

and 23, and R4 and 24 in Figs. 1 and 2 of the Tanaka reference. As clearly shown in Figs. 1 and 2, the bit arrays 21-24 each has four bits in them, one for each of the processors P1-P4. These bits (i.e. bits of bit array 21-24) indicate when one or more of the processors P1-P4 has access to shared registers R1-R4 (e.g. see Col. 3, lines 23+). The shared registers R1-R4 are used to read/write the data by the processor(s) once they get access to them. Accordingly, the claim 1 is clearly anticipated by the Tanaka reference.

In response to (b), the phrase "the access type being selected from the group that includes READ, READ/CLEAR, READ/SET, and READ/WRITE" of claim 3 is interpreted as "the access type has to be either READ, READ/CLEAR, READ/SET, or READ/WRITE (i.e. one of the four)". Since in the Tanaka reference, once register access is given to any of the four processors that the select processor can

read/write into that register, it is considered as READ/WRITE access type is being given/chosen..

MATTHEW KIM

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100